

IX.

And that no man may pretend ignorance, or be unprepared for this service (if the Parliament shall think fit) let the time and place of this going forth be published the day before, and especiall order be given, that every man throughout the City and Suburbs, rich and poore, old and young, that is any way fit to appear in person or purse, and would not be taken to be an enemy unto the State, may be strictly required the night before (by some appointed to go from house to house for that purpose) to appear at the place where these Tents shall be fixed the next day: and let a penaltie as aforesaid be inflicted on them that shall be found unwilling to help quench a flaming Kingdom.

X.

If in 4. or 5. dayes time an Army be this way raised, and good summes of money provided to maintain it; how soon then may the City be put into a gallant posture; Shops be opened, Trading set up again at home, while our Armies are dealing with our Enemies abroad; and a brave Kingdom which now lies a bleeding, through Gods mercy be yet timely secured.

How easily and speedily may all this be done, if men have hearts to go about it? Many hands make light work; Much must be done in little time, or else we perish. *Concordia parva res crescunt*: But Parliament-breaches of Covenant, against a jealous God, oh how ominous and how dreadfull! Remember the curse, Jer. 48. 10. *Cursed be he that doth the work of the Lord negligently, and cursed be he that withholdeth the Sword from blood.*

England may this day know, that London can yet afford an 100000. men, if need be, as well in deed as in word, to live and die with the House of Commons, maugre all aspersions that have been cast upon it. Up therefore and be doing, our Noble Senatours, be valiant for the Truth, and the Lord of Hosts shall be with You.

F I N I S.

IX.

And that no man may pretend ignorance, or be unprepared for this service (if the Parliament shall think fit) let the time and place of this going forth be published the day before, and especiall order be given, that every man throughout the City and Suburbs, rich and poore, old and young, that is any way fit to appear in person or purse, and would not be taken to be an enemy unto the State, may be strictly required the night before (by some appointed to go from house to house for that purpose) to appear at the place where these Tents shall be fixed the next day: and let a penaltie as aforesaid be inflicted on them that shall be found unwilling to help quench a flaming Kingdom.

X.

If in 4. or 5. dayes time an Army be this way raised, and good summes of money provided to maintain it; how soon then may the City be put into a gallant posture; Shops be opened, Trading set up again at home, while our Armies are dealing with our Enemies abroad; and a brave Kingdom which now lies a bleeding, through Gods mercy be yet timely secured.

How easily and speedily may all this be done, if men have hearts to go about it? Many hands make light work; Much must be done in little time, or else we perish. *Concordia parva res crescunt*: But Parliament-breaches of Covenant, against a jealous God, oh how ominous and how dreadfull! Remember the curse, Jer. 48. 10. *Cursed be he that doth the work of the Lord negligently, and cursed be he that withholdeth the Sword from blood.*

England may this day know, that London can yet afford an 100000. men, if need be, as well in deed as in word, to live and die with the House of Commons, maugre all aspersions that have been cast upon it. Up therefore and be doing, our Noble Senatours, be valiant for the Truth, and the Lord of Hosts shall be with You.

F I N I S.

A
CHRISTIAN PLEA
FOR
CHRISTIANS BAPTISME:

Raised from the grave of *Apostasie.*

O R,
A SHORT TREATISE,
Being a reproof of some things written by
A.R. in his Treatise, intituled, **The vanitie**
of Childish Baptisme.

In the Answer whereof,

The lawfulness of Infants Baptisme is defended, the sufficiency
of our Baptisme received in the state of *Apostasie*, shewed: and
the deficiencie of the Arguments brought against it mani-
fested, by sufficient grounds and reasons drawn from the
sweet fountains of holy Scripture.

S. C. Ridley.

Ezek. 37.12, 13, 14. *O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, &c.*

2. Chron. 30.18 19. *The good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to seek God, the Lord God of his fathers, though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary.*

Jer. 9.25.26. *Behold, the daies come, saith the Lord, that I will punish all them which are circumcised, with the uncircumcised. Egypt, and Judah, and Edom, and the children of Ammon, and Moab, and all that are cut off into corners, that dwell in the wilderness: for all these Nations are uncircumcised, and all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in the heart.*

Rev. 11. 1, 2. *And there was given me a reed like unto a rod, and the Angel stood, saying, Rise and measure the Temple of God, and the Altar, and them that worship therein. But the Court which is without the Temple cast out, and measure it not: for it is given unto the Gentiles, &c.*

May . 25 . LONDON:

Printed by T. P. and M. S. and are to be sold by Ben. Allen in
Popes-head-Alley. 1643.

CHRISTIANITY

Я О Л

CHRISTIAN BAVARIA

Raised from the stage of politics.

THE COTTAGE DIARY.

To the Author's Note

The following is a list of the names of the members of the Board of Education, and the date of their election.

卷之三

Bobes-Peron-Afrika. 243.



TO THE CHRISTIAN

READER, Grace, Mercie, and Peace
be multiplyed, &c.



Aving considered, that the weaknesse, and frivilousnesse, of the Arguments brought by A. R. against Baptisme, deserved no Answer; and conceiving that most of them were publickly confuted in print *, before any of them were thus published, I thought not to have meddled with them in such a publick way.

But further considering, that the said Arguments of his, were divulged in print, and might

do much hurt amongst some ignorant people, who would do better if they knew better; I thought it meet to help to take off this new wizard, put upon the Anabaptists old out-worn arguments, and so to pull down this little torturing turret of Babel; because that in this false fire, and light of the sparks of these crackling thornes, the makers thereof delight still to walke, and some are yet deluded, by such frothie Divinitie, and smokie clouds of sublime sophistry; without due triall of them, by the light of Gods Word; or weighing them in the balance of the Sanctuary.

Wherefore, in obedience to God, and love to his people; I have here undertaken to use my talent in vindicating the harmfullnesse of Christians Baptisme, raised with them out of the grave of the Apostacie of the man of sinne, which hath been for many yeare, in which Apostacie estate, and wretched condition, the name of God hath been greatly profained, his institutions (though not destroyed) yet highly abused, to the desolation of many souls; out of which state, God hath called some, who have obeyed his voyce, and come out of Babel to Sion; and are as dearly beloved of God, as the pensive Israelites, whom God in former time brought from Jeroboams apostacie to Iudah, where they kept the feast, unto the Lord, and were both young, and old, accepted of him, though they retained the Circumcision which they received in that apostacie estate, where there was neither true visible Church, ministry, worship, nor government, but all diabolicall, and Apostaticall: yes (God having reserved his own ordinance pure unto himself) the evill of the manner being repented of, by them,

*By Ainsworth,
Wilkinson,
Clifton,
Robinson,
& divers others.

To the Christian Reader.

nothing is selfe was not commanded to be administered upon them again. And surely, God could have commanded that Circumcision [done in Apostacie, by a wrong administrator, and by a false power, and upon a wrong subject,] to have been esteemed as not done at all, and that the parties when they returned from that Apostacie, should have been circumcised again; but he would not, no more had he commanded us to be baptised again, though we were baptised in an Apostate state: for Baptisme is as durable as Circumcision, and God is as able to purge baptism now, as he was to purge Circumcision then.

But Mr. A. R. hath taken upon him to prove the Baptisme which we Christians received (in the state of Apostacie) to be none of Gods Baptisme; but insufficient; In the prosecution whereof, he alledgeth severall particulars, by which he would disprove the same: which particulars are examined, and his inferences from thence answered in the ensuing discourse. But it would not have been amisse, if he had well considered (for abridgement of his work) that baptism, being (by his own confession) a great ordinance of the New Testament; To make it lesse generall, or lesse durable then Circumcision, or inferior theremto, would be to make Christ lesse faithfull in his house then Moses; and inferior to him: But baptism is more generall then Circumcision: And Christ is more excellent then Moses, and Baptisme is as durable as Circumcision. Therefore seeing Circumcision was not worne out by those; Baptisme is not worne out by these.

Think not (Christian Reader) that I intend to plead for the Apostate Church of Rome, or any of her daughters, or for their ministry, worship, or Government! So farre am I from this, that I utterly renounce, and disclaim the same; and leave the justification of them to the disposition of those who account them no worse then Heathens that never knew the truth; and seek to lessen their sinne by labouring to vindicate their supposed innocencie, reaching them [in this] to plead ignoramus, and not guilty, when they are justly accused for committing of sacrilege. Yea, and Gods definitive sentence pronounced against them, and his just judgements executed (and daily executing) upon them, as appeareth as this very day, since the sharp arrows of the Almighty have been (and are still) so generally scattered abroad, to the destruction, and ruinacion of those persons; not onely for their abuse of common meats, and drinke, and other temporall blessings; but chiefly (and above all) for the abuse and prophanation of spirituall things, as (the prophanation of) Gods holy word, and ordinances, which they distribute to all sorts of sinners that come under the

To the Christian Reader.

the notion of a verball profission, though they vise in their life and conversation. All which is of us not to be blessed, or excused, as if it were not sacrilege (or theft in an high degree) but rather to be lamented, than those persons who draw near unto God with their mouthes, and outwardly pretend to stand for Christ, and fight for his true Religion; (taking upon them to defend the same, some with the Word, others with the sword) against those who do oppose them) should have their hearts so farre alienated from God, as so much to take his holy Name in vaine, and profane his Sabbaths, as those do who on that day powre out their meat-offerings and drink-offerings, in the idolatrous high places, which being a defilement unto the Land, are by the laws of God destinat^e to destruction. For these and the like abominations (I say) we ought to mourne^a: and that they ^b Ezek. 9. should so steal his ordinances, and abuse his Word, to the destruction and ruination, sprung, and rooteing out of themselves, and their posteritie, from those good and fruitfull lands wherein God of his mercie had planted them.

These and the like evils, were the causes why God did bring upon his people Israel of old, divers hearie and sore judgements, as pestilence, famine, and sword, and wilde beasts to devoure both them and theirs, yea though they were circumcised in flesh, yet because they were not circumcised in heart, God threatened to visit them with the uncircumcised in flesh^c, and make their Cities desolate without inhabitants, and their houses without man, and their land utterly desolate: and that ^d Jer. 9. 25, 26. He would remove them farre away, and never promised to bring them againe from captivitie, nor prophesied good unto any but those who were upright in heart; even the tenth part, (or rather lesse) which were the holy seed, the substance^e, and the remnant^f.

Wherefore, it evidently appeareth, that in an idolatrous estate, and ^g Isa 6. 11. 13, 14. Apostasie condition, there is no true comfort, or consolation to be expectt- ed; though they have and enjoy baptism^h as of old the Jewish Apostates had, and did enjoy Circumcision, but as these are sinners in like manner ⁱ Rev. 9. as those were; so these may expect the same measure of punishment (from ^j Rev. 18. 18, 20, 21. the hand of God) as those had: yea, considering that these have their own actual sins, lying upon them^k; and the sinnes of the wicked Jews both ^l Mat. 23. active and imputative, statively imputed unto them^m: It should make them ⁿ 3 to 3 5, 36. to tremble at the Word of God, which must be fulfilled, which hath decla- ^o 32, 33. red, that judgements are prepared for scorner^p; and that the por- ^q Rev. 18. f Prov. 19. tion of the wicked^rs cup, shall be snares, fire and brimstone, burning ^s 29. stormes and tempests^t: and that hell hath enlarged her self, and ^u Psal. 11. opened ^v.

To the Christian Reader.

opened her mouth without measure; and that their glory, and their multitude, and their pomp, and he that rejoiceth shall descend into it.⁵ Isa. 14.

But as the Lord hath called us out of the sinke of Sodome, and grave of Babylonish and Egyptian Apostasie (where our Lord was crucified;) so we must not dishonour him so farre as to cast away his holy vessel, or any good thing of his which we have received; for God is able to purge those things which are his own; upon our repentance: So that the evill manner of receiving Baptisme doth not argue but that the thing in it self is good, and may be applied to the same end and use for which it was first given. Therefore as we are come out of Babel, so let us labour to imitate Sion, set forth unto us in the Scriptures; which doth teach us not to lay againe the foundation, but to go on unto perfectionⁱ. [even as the children of Israel did when they went up from Jeroboams apostasie, to keep the feast in Judah;] and not (Babel-like) confound both our selves and others, as those do, who deny, and disclaime the ordinance of Baptisme, which they have received in Apostasie; which Baptisme they conceive to be no more then a naturall, or morall act, and not a divine ordinance; thinking to take more advantage against the same, in the prosecution of it, then is given them either from their doctrine, or practise, or any rule revealed in Gods Word.

Yea, they entangle themselves so in the bryars, and thornes of the worldernesse (not knowing by their own grounds which way, or how to take up baptisme) that they are driven now to hold a Church all of unbaptized persons; and that though none of them be baptised, yet the said Church may set apart one or more of her unbaptized members, and give them authoritie to baptize themselves and others^{*}; and yet they grant that baptisme may be where there is no Church, and so (casting away the baptisme which they formerly received) they are driven in taking up their new baptisme^{38 li. 7. 8.} to affirm that an unbaptised person or persons may and must baptise themselves, and after that baptize others, else true baptisme can never be had: but I wish they would apply the counsell to themselves which they

see Mr. Spilsbury^{9. 10. lin.} give unto others, not to depend upon humaine and unwritten traditions, but upon the Word of God, which is the onely rule for every divine action.^{33. to li. 40. p. 39.} Here you see after what manner they lay down, and take up baptisme. But, ^{lin. 33. 33.} Touching Mr. A. R. his manner of baptizing, he doth not tell me in particular, but in generall, he saith, Men and women must be dippt, he doth not declare the particular manner how they must be dippt, but re-serveth that; which thing would be known: In the meane time seeing this

subject

To the Christian Reader. T

subject by way of answer and opposition and then to be treated on by diverse persons; among whom, one of them is a "Poet of the Orient", I insist not much "M. Fleischner".

In bringing his last paricular (concerning the subjects of baptism) he shooteth so awry that he misseth the marke, and doth not speak clear out: for he speakes of Infants in generall, without putting a distinction betweene the Infants of Idolatres, and the Infants of true Christians.

By which it appeareth (as also by the rest of his words touching this matter) that he judgeth all infants to be in one visible estate, which to think is very erroneous.

If God had commanded the Infants of Idolaters to be circumcised, as he commanded the infants of the faishfull Jews and prosolites. And if God in baptizing the Israelites infants in the Red sea^a, had baptised an Infant of wicked parents; if God had destroyed the infants of Abraham with the infants of Sodome^b, and the infants of Israel with the infants of Egypt^c in that extraordinary way: we might have thought the infants of Idolaters and the infants of true Christians to be all in one visible estate; But God commanded no infants to be circumcised but those which were in Covenant with him^d, neither did he baptize any other infants, but put a difference between the holy and profane, both by his words and actions^e. Therefore we have no warrant to judge both infants of believers and the infants of unbelievers to be all in one visible estate. For though God visiteth the iniquities of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation of those that hate him; yet he sheweth mercie to thoulards of those that love him, and keep his Commandments^f.

The denial of Baptisme to the infants of believers ariseth from many grosse and ignorant mistakes of the true sense and meaning of many texts of Scriptures, as also from many foolish concepions and idle dreams, wherewith persons have intoxicated their minds, and wrapped themselves into grievous absurdities. As in other things they bewray a great deale of ignorance, so do they in this about infants, and are driven (in maintenance of this error) to discover more errors in themselves, and to strike at the fundamentall principles of Religion.

b Ver.6.
They suppose that those Scriptures which set forth the excellent privi-
ledges of the faithfull, and their seed, concerne not infants at all, but
only persons of yeare that are capable, and do professe faith, and repentence;
limiting the seed to them of yeare onely: or to Christ's person, barring out
infants in their concepcion from visible union and communion with him.

Where is it said that the Covenant of Circumcision was to be in their

To the Christian Reader.

* Gen. 17. their flesh*, they interpret that flesh to be Christ, where Circumcision
in Scripture is called the signe and seal of the righteousness of
a Gen. 17. faith*, they limit that to Abraham only, and Gen 17. 10. (these
words) this is my Covenant*, they take literally to be a reall Covenant,
without taking the exposition, vers. 11. even as the Papists expound

* For this Matt. 26. 26 This is my body, for his reall and corporall presence.
see A. R. They also would (most absurdly) make Baptisme lesse general, and more
his second book. pa. generall then circumcision, which implyeth a flat contradiction.

24 lin 13. Whereas it is said, He that believeth, and is baptised, shall be sa-
ved, &c. This they say cannot be applyed to any infants; for, say they, in-
fants have no faith either by action, or imputation: then they are driven
forcibly to run upon another absurditie, that either Infants are saved
without faith, or else that they are not saved at all.

Circumcision they conceive was not a seale of the new Covenant; but
of some carnall thing; but this is a carnall affirmation, like the judgement
of him that faith, the Church of the Jews was constituted upon nature,
Pug. 21. and carnalitie; opposite to the spirit, and farre different from the
17. 18. 19. Churches of Christ*.

These absurdities with many more, follow one another like links of one
chain: yea this is an evill under the Sun, that those things which are old er-
rors, by some now adayes are esteemed as new truths. Amongst whom some
there are in particular, who deny the heavenly state, and baptisme of holy
infants, and also the baptisme of Christ received in the state of apostasia, not
distinguisching between a thing well done, ill done, and not done at all: which
dissinctions ought to be observed, both in spirituall and temporall things.

And considering (Christian Reader) that in many things we sin all,
and are subject to erre in our best actions, I earnestly desire thee to take
nothing upon trust, which I set down; but duely trie, and discreetly weigh
the same in the balance of the Lords sanctuary; and if thou recepst any pro-
fit by my paore endeavours, give the glory to God: and wherin I misse it let
me be informed, that the same may (by me) be reformed; for the unchangeable
truth of Jesus Christ we ought to love dearly, prize highly; and purchase
it without ever parting from it, and cherish it, as the Lord doth put it into
our bosome, and so become one with it, even like unto Jesus Christ who is
the way, the truth, the life, and the light of those who in his light do see
light; whose unsearchable riches I desire with all Saints every way to con-
prehend: and therewith bid thee farewell. And so remain,

Thy Christian Brother in the
fellowship of the Gospel,

S C.

A REPROOF OF SOME things written by A. R. in his Treatise intituled, *The unlawfullness of Childish Baptisme*

In the Answer whercof,
The lawfulness of Infants Baptisme is defended, & the suffi-
- ciency of our Baptisme received in the state of Apostasy shewed,
& so brand the deficiencie of the Arguments brought against
it manifested by sufficient grounds
out (and reasons, drawn from the sweet & moist (the new
fountains of holy Scripture) & **Mr. A. Robinson** & denied most satisfactorily (Hilberv-

You have (in your title page and Epistle to the Reader) taken up-
on you to do that which you are not able; and promised that which
you cannot perform, and affirmed that which you cannot prove,
by Scripture: which is, that the Baptisme of Infants is unwar-
rantable, and a meer device, brought into the world for polick
and by-ends, &c. and that therefore (it being the baptisme in the
Church of England) you have undertaken to prove it to be deficient,
and none of Gods Baptisme.

N the entrance of your discourse you confess, That Baptisme is a great ordinance of the new Testament. Pag. 11.

Lo which I adde, that though every ordinance of the new Testament be great, yet there is a difference * So Mr. Spilsbury saith, the subject of Baptisme between them; for some ordinances are active (both in respect of the administrator and partaker thereof,) other ordinances are merely passive (in reference to the parties upon whom the same are administered) amongst which passive ordinances Baptisme is one*. That Baptisme is so (as I have here declared) the Scriptures (Mat. 28. 19. Act. 2. 38.) which you have quoted, do expresse, where the Apostles were commanded to baptise others; And the Disciples are

Josh. 9.

not bidden by Peter to baptise themselves, but to be baptised by others. And (you may know that) the *Eunuch* baptised not himself, but Philip (a baptised person) baptised him : Act. 8. 38. And therefore (in this respect) *baptisme* is unto us, as *circumcision* was to the *Saints* of old, (to wit) an ordinance, not acted by the subject (or receiver) but submitted unto, and suffered; so it is said, *Jacob circumcised the children of Israel the second time*, for they were uncircumcised. God did not require them to circumcise themselves, but *Jacob* (a circumcised person) was to *circumcise* them. Jos. 5. 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9.

And as to *circumcision* then, there was required, a right instrument, a right subject, and an enrighting power ; so there is now required to *baptisme*. But as *circumcision* was Gods, though the subject, and instrument, and power was not right. So is *baptisme* now Gods holy institution, though done by a false minister, upon a false subject, and by a false power. And though these *Anchristians* have no command (or warrant) from God to baptise *Apostates* (or any other persons) no more then the *idolatrous* *Israelites* had to *circumcise*, yet as that *circumcision* then administered, after that manner (contrary to Gods revealed will) was not changed from being Gods, nor done over again, upon those that returned out of that *Apostacie*: So *baptisme* now though it be administered by these *Apostates*, after such an *idolatrous* manner, and upon such *idolatrous* subjects, yet it doth not make a nullite of the ordinance.

By this it appeareth, that you have laid the ground of your reasoning amiss (in bringing your five particulars) to make a nullite of our *baptisme* which we have received in *Apostacie*, the insufficiencie of which grounds of yours, shall be further shewed in the examination of the particulars which follow.

Pag. 12.

Your first particular ground (by which you say you will disprove the *baptisme* in the Church of England) is, because (as you affirme) that the end for which *baptisme* is there administered is to regenerate the infants there baptised; for proof whereof you repeat their forme of words before, and after *baptisme*, [but you mention not the forme of institution, which they pronounce in the act of baptising] and you would argue that because they declare that all men be conceived and born in sinne; and because they say, that our Saviour Christ saith, none can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerated, and born anew, of water and the holy Ghost: and because the Minister beseecheth the people to call upon God the Father through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bannisifull

bountifull mercy he will give to the children, that thing which by nature
they cannot have, that they may be baptised with water, and the holy
Ghost. which is the bane of the world.

And because the Minister and people pray for this beseachinge of
thine infinite mercies, that thou wile mercifully look upon these children,
sanctifie them, and yeaſh them with the holy Ghost, in þen they being deli-
vered from thy wrath, may be received into the Ark of Christ's Church,
and being ſteadfast in faith, joyful through hope, and dares in charity, &c.

We call upon thee for these infants, that they coming to thy holy bap-
tisme, may receiue the remiſſion of their ſinnes, ſpirituall regeneration, &c.

Give thy holy Spirit to þese infants, that they may be born againe, and
be made heirs of everlasting ſalvation.

Also because the Minister (after he hath ſet a little mēſon on the
childrens faces openly forthwith, (without bluſſing,)) ſaith, Now ſaying * Lin. 28.
that these children be regenerated, and graffed in the body of Christ's
congregation, &c. And then exhorts the people to give thanks to God, for
that it hath pleased him to regenerate the infants with his holy Spirit, and
received them for his own children by adoption, &c.

From these premises you would infer that the baptisme is ſafe,
which ground of yours is very weak; yet the ground of your rea-
ſon is amisse, and contrary to reason, and to the commandment of God. and to the commandment of God.
¶ 95 it is no right arguing to bring the mixing of their traditions
as a nihilation of Gods institution. ¶ 28

And their confeſſion that all men be born and conceiued in ſin, and re-
peating of the words of Christ, and the exhortation to fall upon God the
Father through Jesus Christ, that he will give them that of his mercy
which (they confeſſe) by nature they cannot haue, that they might be bap-
tized with water and the holy Ghost. Doth not argue that the baptisme
is not Gods ordinance, for it is neither their high conceptions, or
great estimations, or ſuch verball pronuntiations that doth destroy
or make void Gods holy institutions; yet it is a prophanation of
the Name of God, and ſo it is of the ordinance, because the persons
who administer the ſame, are Idolaters, and the ſubjects upon whom
it is administered, are the ſeed of eþoſtates.

Neither is it their beſeeching God of his infinite mercies, that he
will mercifully look upon þeir children, and sanctifie them, and yeaſh them
with the holy Ghost; that will diſannull the ordinance, and make it of
no effect. Neither doth their praying, that the children may be deli-
vered from Gods wrath, and then they may be received into the Ark of
Christ.

christ. Charras, and by such like fash; joyfull through hope, and record
victorie, &c. overthrow Gods ordinance, and make the Baptisme
received no ordinance of God. Neither doth their acknowledging
of baptisme to be Gods; and so to be holy; and ther's praying for re-
mission of sins for the infants by spirituall regeneration; (nor their
inscribing regeneration to the holy Spirit) prove the baptisme there
administred to be no true baptisme.

And it is not their sprinkling or calling water upon the face of the
children that maketh a validitie of the ordinance; though he without
blushing sayes therin, that the children be regenerated; for whether he blush or now blith, that is nor materiall; to prove the point
which you brought it for.

¶ And though the exhortation which the Minister gives to the peo-
ple together with their assent with their Catechise, the particulars
wholesome (concerning infants regeneration) though they were confir-
med by these Fathers (which you have cited) to be noted; in stead
of many more, yet it doth not argue, but that the baptisme holdeth
firme, though in respect of the manner we allow it not; neither their
Martyr, additions thereto; and though it be done by a wrong administrat-
or Wher- some upon an apostole yet if that Apostle return from his office,
ricar.

¶ Pag. 2. the evill of the manner being repented of, the action hath no need to
be done over again, neither doth God so require it, any more then
he required the apostole Israclites (when they returned) to be circum-
cised again; thin you cannot deny, except you could prove Baptisme
to be less durable then circumcision; as if Christ were less faithful in
his house then Moses.

¶ Again you say, the end for which Infants are baptised in the Church
of England, is to regenerate them, and that they may be born anew; and
accordingly it is concluded in the Catechisme, and confirmed by all these
Souldiers; and divines either will know to join their feete. The mainnes-
ture of this doctrine, that is Baptisme, they receive the holyoy part, that
they are regenerate, and born anew, that they are made the members of
Christ, the children of God, and heires of the kingdom of heaven. In an-
swer to all which (you say) you shall say nothing; but onely reason thus
with som other of these odd principles and practise, and hereby (you
say) you doubt not but it will appear to all, how unfaithfully they have,
and do delude the Nations in this particular.

I answer. As for their unfaithfulness, and their deluding the Na-
tions, I doubt not of it; but with what do they most delude? if not
with

with that which they have (like thieves) stolen away; So the Whore of ^{the} ^{Whore} ^{of} ^{the} ^{City} is said to delude, by commending the stolen waters, and hidden bread for sweetnesse and pleasantnesse, (and so inciting her louers to commit fornication with her); so the Philistines thought ^{a Pro. 9.} the Ark to be a thing ^b, and so indeed it was ^c for it was Gods ^d Ark, and not theirs, but factiously taken by them ^e, and put in ^f Sam. their idolatrous high place for the honour of Dagan their God ^g, Ver. 2. yet it was not sufficient to save them from enemies, but rather to destroy them ^h; yet notwithstanding after it was brought back again, ⁱ &c. the people of God enquired of God by it, and had an answer from ^k Cap. 5. him, which was as follows for the delivering of all Israel ^l whether they were ^m Jews, or ⁿ Professors of Palestina, or any other Nation. ^o Ver. 3. 4.

And though the Israelites in their apostasy deceived both themselves and others, by retaining still an outward profession of God, ^p and praising his outward ordinances, yea; and though they sacrificed unto devils, yet ^q circumcision was not worn out by them; nor ^r repented, when the ^s Apostle returned, but remained true ^t circumcised ^u both to young and old; and they, and their holy seed, were ^v eternally to have a part, and portion, in all the holy things of God, ^w and always as their children came to be capable, they were to manifest ^x before ^y the ^z enemies of Gods Spirit, both ^{aa} faith and ^{ab} love, and all ^{ac} other graces; but if they afterward fell away, and so embraced the ^{ad} papists condition (in which their fore-fathers formerly had been), ^{ae} though ^{af} repentance and ^{ag} regeneration might be preached unto them, yet they had no part in Christs kingdom except they did repent, and become new creatures again; like the impious person in the Church of Corinth, when he was renewed again by ^{ah} repentance. And if any of the members in the visible Church (though never so eminent) commit sinne, they both may, and ought then to be admonished to ^{ai} ^{aj} ^{ak} ^{al} ^{am} ^{an} ^{ao} ^{ap} ^{ar} ^{as} ^{au} ^{av} ^{aw} ^{ay} ^{az} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da} ^{ea} ^{fa} ^{ga} ^{ha} ^{ia} ^{ja} ^{ka} ^{la} ^{ma} ^{na} ^{oa} ^{ra} ^{sa} ^{ta} ^{ua} ^{va} ^{wa} ^{ya} ^{za} ^{ba} ^{ca} ^{da}

their late point of justification, or sanctification) shall not avail them; in that estate, for the Lord abhorreth their best actions, as he did abhorre the best actions of the Apostle Israillites, and therefore circumcision [as it was acted by them] was abhorred by him; but when

* So Mr. Spilsbury grants any of them returned, he bound them not to be circumcised again, but accepted of his own *jewels*, though brought out of the sink and grave of Apostasy.

And so whatsoever good these Antichristians do is evill (as they do it) but if God give any of them a sight of their sinne, they are to repent of the evill of the manner: but for the good thing they have received, they ought not to throw it away, but own it as Gods.

And surely a person may be esteemed to be regenerated, and born again, though in Gods secret decree he was never elected. And yet these learned Divines (as you terme them) are not in such a great staine in defending this, though it be against the Arminians; for truth is more easie to be defended, then error.

Touching that *all likelihood* (which you bring, by this see his Treatise of entering into their heart;) because it is brought onely as *Baptismic* p. 35. lin. 20. to 27. a supposition, as it is sleightlye spited; so it deserves to be sleightlye passed over. And your answer therewerto is

Pag. 5.7. somewhat like it, being an answer to such a likelihood, therefore it deserves no reply: though in answer to these speeches of yours (which you bring as suppositions or likelihoods) you advise the au-

c Pag. 7.1. therof to have affirmiting, and giving glory to God in acknowledg-

16. judgiting the truth, vnde yd misse bowereth saw he not to C. Quinck, which he wrote to

b Lin. 21. thus I affirme whoe bethed, and therfore they may be baptised.

22. vnde to which, your answer, that all infants striveth to bethed, and chery-

c Lin. 23. ffe all infants ought not to be baptised.

24. h. To which I reply, that as the whole world is without distinction, so is

your answer thereto; and therfore except they were excommunicated, it

were folly to affirme either of them. But a man may be in Gods se-

cret election (as you call it) a whistler and a blatter, and do lantheing of idolatrous parents idolaters (in regard of their visible estate) yet we

know that but that God hath elect divers of them, and within his

due time manifest them.

) But you make another weak objection for this: for you say, they

will

17. 28

will reply. That in regard some infants are elected, and none can say that this or that particular infant is not elected, therefore Baptisme must be administered unto all, because we may not deny the elect their priviledges, for fear of giving to others, that which belongs not to them.

And to this mad and foolish objection (which you suffer upon others) you make answer, that if it be a reasonable ground for you to administer baptisme to all infants, because some particular infants are elected, thereby the same reason it will follow, that baptisme may lawfully be administered to every man and woman in the world, because amongst them also we may judge that some are elected: But this (say you) contradiceth the order and rule of Christ. (Matth. 28.19. Mar. 16.16.) and must be ranked amongst other of their sayings before detected. P. 8 1. 6.

To which I reply: That [some] infants are elected cannot be justly denied; But to administer baptisme to [all] infants for fear of omitting it to any of the elect, is to do evill that good may come thereof.

Moreover, all the elect are noz priviledged to have the outward ordinance of baptisme, nor any of them till such time as they are manifested unto us to be visible Saines Again, we know Judas Iscariot, and Simon Magus were baptised, though not elected.

Now the reason which is annexed to the objection, is nonsense, which is for fear of giving to others that which belongs not to them; for in administering Baptisme to [all] they give unto others (besides the elect) that which belongeth not to them; therefore such manner of reasoning will not stand; I seldom have heard the like reasoning, except it were amongst those who deny Infants baptisme to be Gods holy institution.

Now in your answer to this you crosses your selfe in pag. 7. lini. 9. 10. 11. where you say, that God hath not said he will destroy any infants in hell, and it would be censorious for any to judge that they shall be damned, and yet you grant concerning persons of years that they are under the censure of damnation. Therefore by your own ground you cannot so freely baptise all men and women as you can all infants, and therefore it appears that what you build up with one hand, you throw down with the other.

In the second part of your answer to this objection, you grant (for arguments sake) that baptisme is to be administered upon the elect before they manifest faith, in which affirmation, you want a distinction, and explanation, for you ought to have made a distinction betweene faith inherent, and faith professed; that is, you should have declared

that

that faith may be inherent in some only; and professed in others.

Secondly, that all that profess faith verbally have not faith really; and all that have faith really, do not profess it verbally, or manifest it themselves actually.

Again, you should have explained your self, whether you meant by the elect, all the elect, or but some of them, all which you have omitted: wherefore I omit to answer you till you further explain your self. But in the conclusion you affirm, that its true faith only manifested, and made known by confession of the mouth, that gives the elect admission to Baptisme.

To which I answer, that though we cannot know invisibly because it is the onely office of the invisible Spirit, to whom all things are visible, yet we may judge of invisible things, by visible demonstrations; as the Saints before us have done; so God leaving unto us a rule whereby to judge the infants of believers to be elected, it is want of knowledge and charitie which maketh some persons that they cannot judge of them, nor put a difference between the infants of heathens and the infants of believing parents; for the infants of believers in the time of the Law could not be circumcised (according to Gods will) without a confession; but if their parents made a confession, it was sufficient to bring both them and their infants to have right to circumcision; and those infants were Jews (that is, confessors) though they could not make a verball confession themselves actually; and the like privilege the infants of believers have now under the Gospel, to have baptisme, as the other had circumcision, which is one and the same in effect. But when any of the Jews apostated, they lost the names, and so these idolaters of Rome, and England are as those Apostates then were, and so is their off-spring. And when we call the unbelieving Hebrews by the name of Jews (or Israelites,) it is but only for distinction sake: for as the dumbe Idols were called Gods, and yet were no gods, so those are no Jews which confess not Christ; but if any do imbrace Christ in puritie, both they and their infants have right to baptisme, (as really,) as the infants of the believing Jews had right to circumcision they being in the covenant. Else Christ should be lesse faithfull in his house then Moses. For infants were by God counted worthy of the signe and seal of his righteousness both before and under the Law & and Christ coming into the world, came not to take away any priviledge from any infant which formerly enjoyed the same, but placed as great a one (if not greater) in the stead

* Rom. 9. 6. and 2. 28.
a Gen. 17. and yet were no gods, so those are no Jews which confess not Christ;
b Rom. 4. 11.
c Cen. 17. 7. 9. 10.
d Jos. 5. 7. 11. 14.
Exod. 12. 48.
Luk. 1. 59.

stead thereof, he came not to take away the types from the infants of believers, and bereave them both of substances and types, but seeing baptism is come in stead of circumcision, as the infants of believers formerly had right to circumcision, so the infants of believers now have right to baptism.

Thus, though you have passed from your first particular, to your fifth, from the end, to the subject, yet I have given you a direct answer unto both.

THe second particular, which you bring (for disproof of the baptism in the Church of England (is, the manner in which baptism is there administered, which manner (you say) is sprinkling, or casting a little water upon the head or face of the child baptised, wherein (you say) they shew themselves as contrary to Christ as in the former particular. Forasmuch as the institution of Christ requireth that the whole man be dipped all over in water.

To which I answer, that there is little weight in this confused exception of yours, as may plainly appear in observing the particulars; for you lay it down ambiguously, in saying the [head] or face of the child; If you mean that because the face is a part of the head, that they in baptising the face, baptise the head, in it I assent unto you; but if by the head you mean the scull, (or hairy place of the head) if you say they baptise that part by sprinkling or casting water thereon, I doubt not but you are mistaken.

But you would have the whole man to be dipt all over in water, and this institution you would fater upon Christ; But in this your own bare affirmation (though not yours only) the Scripture will not bear you out.

But for confirmation of this your opinion of dipping every part, you quote divers Scriptures, as Matth. 3.11. Mark 1.8. Joh. 1.26. Act. 11. 16. and you tell us they point out a baptism [in] water, but not a baptism [with] water.*

To which I answer, that if they point not out baptism [with] water, then they point out a baptism [without] water, but I thought you had intended to speak here only of the baptism of water (for so the Scriptures quoted do) and if that be your meaning, I pray you to shew (if you can) how these Scriptures (or any other) do point out such a baptism [in] water, and yet not [with] water. To say it is the baptism of water, and yet not [with] water, argueth an impossibilitie, and is (in the self same respect) a flat contradiction, yea, and contrary to reason.

a Lin. 24. Indeed if you had not repeated it again^a, and that in the same terms
 b Lin. 27. without alteration, I might have thought it had been onely an over-
 29. sight of yours. But finding the same thing insisted upon again^b and
 c Pa. 10. again^c, charke it self would not permit me to judge otherwise; but
 lin. 8. that your words seem to import, that persons may receive the true
 baptism of water [in] water; and yet not [with] water. For (after
 you have quoted (Matth. 3. 14. Ego men baptizo humas en hysdati, I
 indeed baptize you in water, Mar. 1. 8. Ego men cbaptisa humas en hm-
 dati, I indeed have baptised you in water. Also Job. 1. 26. Act. 11. 16.)
 you say, all these point out a baptism [in] water, but not a baptism
 [with] water.

* Pag. 9. And whereas^{*} the word [en] (in Rev. 3. 9. 21. Kai hois taipos apet
 li. 22. 23. ethes anente romiba ia) signifieth with.

Pag. 9. You answer, that it never signifieth with, after this word baptizo.
 Pag. 10. Another reason you alledge from Christs being baptised into the
 Jordan. Therefore you conclude again that this word [en] (as used af-
 ter this word baptizo) must signifie [in] and not [with].

But you should take notice that if Christ received the baptism of
 water, he was baptised not onely when he was in Jordan, but there
 was he baptised [with] the Water of Jordan. Wherefore it plainly ap-
 peareth that the word [en] in this place signifieth [with] and there-
 fore you have not done well to say it doth not. You alledge (Grinke
 and Latine) Authors to prove that the word en (as used after this word
 baptizo) must signifie in and not with.

Which thing is contrary to the Scriptures, which speake of the
 baptism of water, neither can such an affirmation stand with reason,
 but is contradictory to it self, and therefore not to be beleaved.

But the dipping of the whole man all over in water is that you
 stand for; but yet you have not proved it to be of Christs ordaining,
 you deny both washing and sprinkling with water, to be Gods ordi-
 nance; and affirme dipping is the onely right way: but seeing you de-
 nie the former, how will you take (or how have you taken) up the
 latter; if you hold it successively, to the successours you must then
 go, if you have not found (or cannot finde) them which way then
 have you taken (or which way wil you take) it up? But by one whom
 you judge to be an unbaptised person. Moreover, you tell us that
 the whole man must be dipped all over, but you declare not unto us the
 way and manner thereof; whether the subject must go into the water
 himself, or whether he must be put in by another, or onely led in, or

. 1619703 carried,

carried; or (if the party must go in) whether he must be lifted up, out of the water, and so dipped down again; or no; or whether, onely that part that is above the Water, (must be dipp'd, and that part under the water let alone) or if the subject be dipped all but a part, whether he must be dipped again in whole, or in part, or if there be any error in your dipping, in omission or commission whether it maketh a nullitie of your ordinance, how your judgement standeth in these things I know not: you stand for dipping, yea and dipping the whole man all over in water; not onely the feet but also the hands and head; but what if some part or parts be missing? is it not true baptisme? But furthermore how shall this baptisme be done by a weak person, especially in great and deep waters (which thing you urge in your discourse) how shall this dipping of every part be done in such rivers where the stremme is ready to carrie them away (especially when he who is the baptiser is weak of body, and listeth up the (man or woman) above the water) these things are to be observed also.

But surely it is not good to presume above what is written in the Word of God, either in justifying of our selves, or condemning of others. And if you do, but well observe the manner how Philip baptised the Eunuch, peradventure you may receive some light in this point, whereby you may be dissuaded from your totall dipping: for it is said that Philip and the Eunuch went both down into the water, and there Philip baptised the Eunuch, which doth plainly demonstre, unto us, that going into the water is no part of baptisme; because the baptisme was administred after their going into the water; for if it had been a part of baptisme, then the Eunuch baptised himself, for he went into the water. But the Scripture saith, that they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptised him. Neither is it said, that Philip baptised himself (which by the same reason we may conceive he did, if going into the water were a part of baptisme) but the Scripture noteth the going down into the water, and the being baptised with the water, as two distinct things. Neither is it said, that Philip baptised the Eunuchs feet, or legs, for the Eunuch was in the water before, and at the time of his baptisme, but it is said, Philip baptised him; to wit, a part of him for the whole, which part in reason must be conceived to be his face, under which externall noble part is comprehended the whole man, and all the senses of his body. So the Scriptures in divers places teacheth us to understand, that a part sometimes is to be taken for the whole; so it

A&B.36.
38. seq. deod
1. act. 1.12

washed with the blood of Christ, are dead unto sinne, and do live unto righteousness. The Law was their Schoolmaster to lead them unto Christ; but sprinkling was a part of the Law, an action of Gods appointment, therefore it was to lead them unto Christ: and if we do

* Num. 19 but observe, we shall understand that the Red heifer * was a figure of Christ, the killing of it, and burning it on the Altar, signified the death of Christ, and his bitter passion; the Albes being to be mixed with living water, and so that water to sprinkle the people set all this forth unto them: It was to teach them that the blood of Christ was only sufficient to purge sinne, it was therefore to teach them mortification of the old man, a dying to sinne, and a living to righteousness, through the mercie of God, and the Messias who was then to come; yea, and it did also really figure out unto them, Gods gracious acceptance of them, and of that sacrifice for them, for so the turn-

* Psal. 20. * 3. ing of the burnt offering unto ashes did signify *, and so the sprinkling was to put them in mind of the same; and whereas it was mixed with living water, and so imposed upon them, it was to teach them, that so their sinnes should be washed away through Christ: and to this the Apostle alludeth, where he mentioneth pure water. Now he that is a self-denying Christian dead unto sin, and so mortified, he is buried with Christ by a baptisme without hands; And when he apprehends Gods gracious love and mercy, and free acceptation of him through Christ, he may wel be said to be risen with Christ: all these things the sprinkling was to teach them, to behold Christs day afarre off; And yet you presume to say, that sprinkling or washing without dipping bath no [simili-]

A.R p. 11. & 12. Jude] with death, burring, and rising again*: But why then doth the li. 24. 25. Scripture so plentifully set forth our mortification, repentance from

* Heb. 10. dead works, dying to sin, and living to righteousness under such terms.

* as washing and sprinkling, if sprinkling and washing did not bear out

Eze. 36. 25 a similitude thereof. And why doth the Scripture give that the deno-

* 1 Cor. 10. 1. mination of baptism*, which was not done by dipping them (or plun-

10. 1. 2. ging them) in the element. Surely these things being rightly consi-

Luk. 15. dered, it will evidently appear, that the baptism done by sprinkling

Isa. 2. 14. and washing is not onely a full resemblance of our mortification or

a 1 Cor. 6. washing from our sinnes, and the cleansing of our souls by Christs

11. blood, and so a dying to sinne, and a living to righteousness*; a put-

b Gal. 3. ting on of Christ, &c. but also holds forth unto us the death of

27. [Christ] and his bitter passion*, yea self-denial, and forsaking of all

c Luk. 12. 50. for Christs sake, as much, yea, and much more then dipping the whole

man without washing can do.

Yea

Yea the Apostle Peter intimateth that the *externall baptisme* is a *washing away of the filth of the flesh* (holding forth no more then an *externall ordinance* can hold forth). This Peter could speak by experience, for he knew that *Simon Magus*, who believed outwardly had the outward *washing*, and yet manifested himself afterwards to be in the gall of *bitternesse*, and in the bonds of *iniquitie*^a; but the *baptisme* which is onely available to salvation, is the answer of a good *conscience* toward God, that is the *baptisme* indeed which sauerth by the *resurrection of Jesus Christ*^b: Now he that hath his heart sprinkled ^b 1 Pet. with the *blood of Christ*, he may fully assure himself that he shall be ^c 3.21. *saved*, and so he is risen with *Christ* though he want the *outward baptisme* (which you grant is nothing in comparison of *Christ*^c) and so he ^c In the having part in *Christ* who is the *resurrection and the life*^d, he shall not second be hurt with the *second death*. Rev. 2. 11. and 20. 6.

WHO Y smid this
Treatise,
pa. 17.

d Joh. 1.1.

But this your dipping of the whole man all over in water, you would have to hold forth not onely death and *buriall*, but also a *rising again*^a; and for this end you mention some words of the *Apostle Paul*, Col. 2. 12. *Buried with him by baptisme*, wherein you are also risen with him, &c. Rom. 6. 4. 5. *We are buried with him by baptisme into his death*. And if we have been planted together in the *likenesse of his death*, we shall also in the *likenesse of his resurrection*. And in 1 Cor. 3. 29. St. Paul amongst other arguments to prove the *resurrection* hath these words, *What shall they do which are baptised for dead, if the dead risen not at all; Why then are they baptised for dead?*

The first Scripture (Col. 2. 12.) speaketh of a *resurrection* then *Answ.* present, and the other Scriptures (Rom. 6. 5. 1. Cor. 15. 29) speake of a *resurrection* to come. Now in the *resurrection* at the day of judgement the *blind* shall receive their sight^{*}, though the eyes which are the instrument of their sight are perished; and though a person have lost his legs, or his armes, or any *externall member* of his body, (that is not superfluous) yet he being not thereby killed is (according to his capabilitie) still to believe, that all those breaches shall be made up in the *resurrection*; now if you should happen to baptise such a one by dipping which hath such defects in nature, as the want of his legs, armes, or eyes, &c. will you say that that *baptisme* setteth forth unto him no more but onely the *raising* of those *externall parts* which you then dip; then you will have it to set forth a *blind* (or lame) *resurrection*. But if you will say, the *baptisme* he receiyeth at your hands setteth forth the *resurrection* of all the parts, both those parts that are missing,

* Rev. 1.7
Job 19.

24,25,26.

27.

missing, and those parts that are not; those members that are baptised, and those members that are not baptised: then the case is evident that (the eminent part (or parts) of the body being baptised) the said baptisme setteth forth the same benefit unto the rest of the members; for in the resurrection if one member be had in honour, all shall be had in honour.

For further explaining of the matter, I put this ordinarie case unto you, (and desire you to consider thereof) Suppose a man come unto you to be baptised, and wanteth one, or both of his legs, arms, eyas, or other exterrall members, what now is to be done in this case? Peradventure you will say that you cannot baptise those members that are not to be found; So say I too: But what then? if those members were (or are) to be found? must you needs seek for those; to baptise them with him? You will say, No! that would be a sensesse thing to baptise that which hath no more life in it then a stone! I also affirm the same. But what is further to be done? will you proceed and baptise this believer, or leave him unbaptised? You will say, He is a believer, though he want his eyes, legges, armes, &c. and therefore he must be baptised, though he want those exterrall members. Yea, but then I ask you whether you do not conceive that your baptisme is a buriall, and a rising again, and whether you do not beleive that it setteth forth unto the lame man the resurrection of [all] his members, as well as if all his members had been baptised; I suppose you will say, Why not? there is no reason can be given to the contrarie, considering that those members shall be raised with the body at the resurrection. But then I desire you to remember this, and bear in mind what will follow, namely, that baptisme setteth forth the resurrection of those exterrall members which were never baptised, and therefore that which you esteeme to be no baptisme, or but a baptising [in part] setteth forth the resurrection of the [whole] bodie; and so totally of [all] the members thereof, and belonging therunto; so that the face (or eminent part of a man) being baptised though the rest of the members are not wet with water, yet this baptisme holdeth forth the resurrection of the whole body. I meane not onely a spirituall resurrection, but a translation of the naturall body into a spirituall body, and this is the resurrection the Apostle speaketh of when he saith, What shall they do that are baptised for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why then are they baptised for dead? 1. Cor. 15. 9.

* Pa. 12. Your conclusion of this point* which is grounded upon a supposition,

sition, I reject, because it openly contradicteth the Scripture, 1 Cor. 10.2. 1. Pet. 3. 27. Mat. 20. 22. Luke 12. 50. Isa. 14. 15. For you say, that he that is not dipped, is not baptised; and that all those that have the administration of baptism by sprinkling, or by any washing without dipping are unbaptised. Which I denie, and that from the grounds before alledged; remember (I pray you) how you urge the greatnessse of the quantitie of the *element*, to be of such necessarie to baptism, that except a person have so much, wherein he may dip the whole man all over, baptism cannot be rightly administred upon him; and so by your grounds not administred at all.

And this is one of the particulars, by which you would disprove the baptism in the Church of England.

Now, though in the Church of England the manner of baptising is by sprinkling, washing, or pouring the water upon the most eminent part of the subject, which is there presented to be baptised, yet in the Church of Rome, and in some places of England, and the dominions of Wales, they have used, and do use dipping of persons in the ordinance of baptism; which is a thing [in respect of the manner] pleasing unto you (and therefore in this second particular not here excepted against by you) for in striking at the manner, you have in this touched nothing, but [only] their washing, sprinkling, or pouring of water upon the partie, whereon it is administred.

Your third ground (or particular) by which you labour *to disprove the baptism in the Church of England, and make it to be of none effect, is, because of the Antichristian power, authoritie, and office of ministry by which it is administred: and so you conclude, that because their power and authority is not of Christ: therefore the baptism is not from Christ *.

To which I answer, That I grant they have no enrighting power lin. 1.2. to administer any of the holy things of God, no more then the *Apostate Israelites*, yet as that Antichristian power by which they did administer, destroyed not circumcision, but that it remained true circumcision: so baptism, (being as dureable as circumcision) it cannot be worne out by these *Apostates*, no more then circumcision was by the other.

And what right had the *Philistines* to the *Arke*? or what authority had the *Babylonians* to steal the vessels of the *Lord*? or what power had *Idolaters* to lay sacrelegious hands upon any of his *holy institutions*? Surely they had no such commission, either from *God* or

Christ, so todo; yet, I hope, you will not say, that the Ark was no Arke, the vessel no vessel, the institutions (as in themselves) nothing at all; for then you would openly contradict the Scripture*.

* 1. Sam. 4.
& 5.
Dan 5.3.13.
Ezra 6.5.
Ezek. 43.8.
Rev. 11.2.

* Pa. 13. at li.
27.

The like may be said concerning Gods institutions under the defection of Antichrist, the marriage, is marriage; though the manner be not performed lawfully: the word is the word of God, and baptism his own, though in apostasy.

And whereas you say*, that as the Lord Jesus Christ hath nowhere in his Word ordained or appointed any women to administer his baptism. Nor no more hath he any where in his Word authorised any men by any false power to administer his baptism.

I answer. The like may be said concerning circumcision; We read

* And yet Mr. Spilsbury in his Treatise of circumcision; and God (who is the God of order) never gave wicked men any order to circumcise, or any one by any false power to administer his signe, and seal of the righteousness of faith; and yet though it were administered in that Apostate estate, of Israel by apostates, and of necessity upon Apostates, yet it made no anallite of the ordinance, but was the signe and seal of the righteousness of faith to those that returned out of the grave of that Apostasy.

Therefore the ground which you draw by similitude from the civill states (applying the same comparatively to the spirituall) will not serve your turne. For the Kings Proclamations are his, though proclaimed by any: which thing you would have to be nothing*; for in speaking of the ordinances of the common wealth, you include them all, and so you would inferre that what an Antichristian ministry doth, if it be done by a false power, the action (whether it be baptism, or any other thing) it is false: but this your ground will not hold. For the Kings lawfull acts are reall, and substantiale, though the dispensation of the same (in respect of the party dispensing) be contrary to his mind and will. As if the King command that none in his Realme shall marrie persons together, but the Christian Magistrates. But if the Priests do the same contrary to the Kings command, shall we say the Parties are not married, and that the marriage is false and counterfeit? this I conceive you will not affirme*. So your former ground being groundlesse, your comparison is frivolous:

* Pa. 13. p. 14.

* For then their children begotten (in that estate) are bastards.

And considering that Gods ordinance of circumcision was reall and effectua-

effectually, though administered by a false pastor, you cannot say that it was none of Gods ordinance, for then they should have been absolved again: so the like may be said concerning baptism. Therefore * Pa. 14. at l 26
 your other comparison and application * [in this case] labour ^{of} *fables* and *fancies* rods, &c. (2. Tim. 3. 9. Exod. 7. 10. ver. 11. 12.) is of no weight, but rather a wresting of some words of the Scripture, for you can gather no such conclusion out of Pauls words, neither by any part of the Scripture it self, or necessary consequence; for though those Antichristians (in opposing the truth) are like *Fakers* and *Famblers*, yet because they draw near unto God with their mouths, (and their hearts farre from him) they are rather like the *Apostate* *Q[ua]ristians* *whom* *over* *the* *world* *brought* *on* *to* *the* *gospel* *in* *jealousy*.

For which Papist (of the grossest of them) will deny verballie that Christ is com in the flesh, that there are three persons in the Trinity, &c. so farre are they from denying it, that they abhorre those that say to the contrary, and are ready to burne them with fire and faggot. Such a kind of zeal have they for him whom they know not rightly, but in their superstitious works denie him. And (by your own confession**) the Church of England doth in their nineteenth Article professe, that the visible Church of Christ consisteth of faithfull men, &c. this is a reall truth; And yet these persons (I say) do deny Christ, because they submit not unto him as he is Prophet, Priest, and King. And yet notwithstanding we will not say but that these Apostaticall persons have baptism, and as much right unto it, and power and authoritie to administer it, as the Apostates of old had to receive and administer circumcision. But the Temple, and the Altar, and the worshippers must be measured, when the Court which is without (by Gods command) must be left out, and not measured, because it was given to the Gentiles. Rom. 11. 27. * *emendat* *obligo* *uo*

Fourthly, (you * say) the ground from which baptism is there administered, is the repentance and faith of the surretors; the evidence whereof you bring out of the *Catechisme*; where they declare, that repentance and faith is required in baptism; and that the infants performe it by the surretors, who take upon them to answer for the infants.

Answ. That repentance and faith is required to baptism is true; but seeing the surretors are not able to performe it for themselves, much less can they do it for others. It is not Noah, Daniel, or Job that can save any sinner from Gods wrath^a; the righteous are scarcely saved themselves^b; how then shall the wicked undertake so presumptionally

* Pa. 14. at l 26

** Pa. 15. l. 20.

Christian Re-

ader understand

that whereas

Mr. A. R. hath

(in his treatise

of Baptisme, p.

12. 10 22. p. 3 1.

31.) spoken

against the

power and au-

thoritie, and

office of mini-

stry, which the

man of sin hath

given to the

Ministers of

Antichrist, I

contradict him

not in this, but

do judge them

(in the same

visible estate)

as *Ieroboams*

apostatical

priests were,

though they

have baptism

as the other

had circumcision.

* Pag. 33. to p.

24. lin 4.

^a Ezek. 14. 14

^b 1. Pet 4. 19.

to answer for any, especially for those whom God (in his revealed will) hath made no promise to save ; yet though the members of the Church of England do presume so farre, it doth not make a nullitie of the ordinance, no more then the Philistines presumption in taking the Arke of God ^c, or the men of Bethshemosh their looking therein ^d, made it to be no Ark of God ; neither doth mens traditions destroy Gods institutions ; for Gods pillars and posts are still his own , though Idolaters do set theirs thereby ^e.

But though some in the Church of England do baptise by surties, (which they commonly call godfathers and godmothers,) yet others see it to be vaine and papish, and do baptise their children without them, these [in respect of the ground which you have here instanced] you cannot object against.

Now, the ground wherfore the Church of England doth administer baptism, is taken out of Gods Word ; (at least pretended (by them) so to be) ; how Christ declared that little children belong to the kingdom of God ; and he took them up in his arms, & laid his hands upon them and blessed them, &c. yea from the very institution of Jesus Christ unto his disciples, Matth. 28. 19. Mark. 16. 16 ; this I say (though it be the ground whereby they administer baptism, as (peradventure) the ground of the Apostates of Israel circumcising, was taken from the commission of God given to Abraham) yet these Idolaters (like the Apostle Israelites) are sacralegious abusers of this holy institution of God.

Thus having answered directly to your foure particulars, which you have brought against the baptism in the Church of England ; I now proceed to answer your fift and last particular ; (as wit) concerning the subjects which you treated of, in your first particular, where you passed from the end to the subject.

Pag. 24. **T**he subjects (say you) on which baptism is there administered are infants.

To which I answer, that you have omitted a materiall word, for you should have said the infants of [Idolaters] but when you speake of infants [in generall] without denoting what sort of infants you mean ; you speak in the aire !

But you grant that the Scripture holdeth forth, that disciples (or believers) onely are to be baptised ; which is really my judgement, that only believers (or disciples) are to be baptised, as formerly they were to be circumcised ; and as Abraham himself had no command to circumcise all nations, or seeds, (or any apostate whatsoever, though the

the off-spring of his body) but those that were the seed in covenant with God*, so the Apostles had no warrant to baptise any other, but * Gen. 7.
believing men and women, and their holy seed; according to the great 14.
commission of our blessed Saviour, where all nations were command-
ed to be baptised, onely upon this condition, that they should be-
come disciples, Mat. 28.19. Mar. 16.15. Act. 2.38. And I grant
with you, that to be a disciple of Christ is to abide in him, and to continue
in his words, Joh. 8.31. such are Christs disciples indeed, and are made
free by Christ*; such as beare the crosse, and come after Christ, forsaking * Joh. 8.
all that they have; But know this, that free justification cometh not 36.
by any act of our own, but by the righteousness of Jesus Christ, im-
puted unto us*. And therefore holy infants may be said in one re- * Isa. 63.
spect to do all these things; Christ himself hath declared, that they 3.5 & 53.
receive the kingdom of God; and such holy infants are his disciples in-
deed; such have born the crosse divers times, suffering with their holy 10, 11, 12.
parents, for the same cause; and they resist not the will of God in any Rom. 3.6.
thing; these are not all infants, but onely the infants of believiting pa- Rev. 1.5.
rents, whom we ought to judge as righteous, and as holy (till they 5, 6, 7, 8,
manifest otherwise) as any other Saint on earth, though he professeth 9, 10.
great things; these are those heavenly creatures, to whom the Gospel
ought be applyed though they are uncapable to receive it actually;
yea when the Gospel is verbally applyed to the parents, their infants
are not exempted, but received, according to Christs words unto
Zacchaeus, To day is salvation come to this house, for as much as he also is
the sonne of Abraham*. Christ hath promised life to those that chuse * Luk. 19.
life, and also to their infants; and therefore the same infants have 9.
faith imputatively, for he that believeth not, shall be damned. So that
it appeareth, that salvation cometh not but by faith in Christ.

For as much then as the Scripture is so clear, that these holy infants are saved, and seeing that salvation cometh not without repen-
tance and faith: It is too much presumption to say, that infants are
destitute of faith and repentance; though all the men in the world
would grant it.

But I do wonder what is the maine ground that doth drive you,
or, the greatest reason (or conceit) that doth draw you so to deter-
mine concerning infants*, as if they were destitute of the heavenly * Pag. 25.
gifts and graces of Gods Spirit; Is it because they cannot verbally
expresse (or actually perform) such things, as those of riper yeers
can do? If this be your greatest reason, it will not beare down the

least weight in the ballance of Gods sanctuary; as may easily appear, who was a son of man on earth, and the Son of God in heaven.

But though baptisme in the Church of England be administered upon the wrong subjects (namely the seed of Idolaters) and though eternall life be sought and promised by them another way then God hath appointed; yet to affirm, that because some infants are not meet subjects of baptisme, that therefore no infants are, is a saying founded upon the sands, and fetched out of the fond fictions of mens brains, and not from the word of God.

Your best way had been this, to have searched into the records of holy Scripture, and observed the nature of the ordinance of circumcissons, and compared the same signe and seal of righteousness with baptisme, and so to have found out the equivolence which the ^{a Gen. 17. 13.} one hath with the other, and then you should have examined whether the circumcision of ^{b Rom. 4. 11.} Apostate Infants were according to the will of God, and if it were not, whether they were commanded (by the Lord) at their returning to be circumcised again; If it had been so, then you might have had ground to have beaten down the baptisme, which is received in the Church of England: but this is not the way you take; but instead of this you shoot at rovers; not keeping to the matter in hand. And till it can be proved that the circumcision of Infants was none of the Lords circumcision, I must still say, that the baptisme of Infants is the Lords baptisme; wherefore stand to your cause, and bring forth your strong reasons. For as yet your reasons are verie weak, though you conceive you have brought them to such an issue, that, you say ^{c Col. 2. 11, 12.} you shall now proceed no further therein: yet (I say) except you can make void the covenant of Abraham so much, that it doth not appertain to the infants of believing parents, as well as to the parents themselves, and that the application of the Gospel appertaineth not to them also, and that the generall commission of Christ includeth not infants, [which you can never do while the world stands, seeing the Scripture (in this point) is so clear against you] I must still say, that the baptisme of such infants is lawfull, and warrantable; yea forasmuch as it was acted by God, and instituted by Christ, it ought to be practised by his Saints, perpetually to the end of the world: and the further you go on in gainsaying this truth, the deeper is your sin: and in a little time to come you will

^{d Mat. 28. 19.} For all unbaptised persons to whom the application of the Gospel doth appertain, are expressly commanded (by Christ) to be baptised. But

But the application of the Gospel appertaineth to the infants of believynge parents.

Therefore all such infants (if they be not alreadie baptised) are expressly commanded (by Christ) to be baptised.

The first part of this argument is proved from Mar. 16. 16. The second, namely, that the application of the Gospel appertaineth to these infants is proved.

1. By the covenant of Abraham, which was a covenant of life, generally made with Gods visible Church both young and old. Gen. 17. 7.

Secondly, by the testimony of Christ, that they are part of the substance of his Fathers kingdom, and the service although they be but at [small] quantitioun, yet they are spirittually holy, and therefore have a right to baptisme, the signe and seale of the righteousness of faith, (as really) as the infants of the believing Hebrews had right to circumcision the signe and seal of the same righteousness of faith.

Therefore this administering of baptisme upon such holy infants, doth not prevent the administering of baptisme upon disciples (or believers) as you falsely speak*. * Pa. 27.

For seeing the infants of believers are not placed among dogs, and whoremongers without, they are within the new Jerusalem, and have right to the holy Citie, and the privileges thereto. For Jesus Christ (Rev. 22. who is yesterday, to day, and the same for ever. Hebr. 13. 8.) never gave them such a dismission, that they should not be members of his visible Church, as heretofore they have been, (Exod. 12. 48.) but rather he hath confirmed them therein, (Jer. 30. 20.) for all the promises of God are yea, and Amen, in Christ. 2 Cor. 1. 20.

Therefore, I desire rather to magnifie the mighty power of God by which the infants of Israel were baptised in the dayes of Moses, & Cor. (before the Law was given on mount Sinai^b) then deny them baptisme now in the dayes of the M^cssias, or call the baptisme of such infants a device of mans braine: and no baptisme of Christ, as you have here presumptuously (or (at least) ignorantly) done^a, you plead a gainst the baptising of infants destitute of faith.

But those infants are the infants of idolatrous parents, whom we are not to name among the living in Jerusalem^b, till either one or both of their parents repente, or till they renounce their parents sinnes, according to that in Ezk. 18. 14. 17. And the baptisme of those infants I do not allow of, but would have them to be put by; but some of them being baptised (though not aright) shall we say that that

baptisme

baptisme is no baptisme, or that it is another baptisme then the baptisme of beleevers; no surely, there is no more externall baptismes of water, then there were externall circumcisions. Now if you can prove, that there were (appointed by God) divers externall circumcisions, both in respect of the nature, end, and use therof, (one circumcision for infants, another for elder persons) and that the circumcision of infants prevented the circumcision of Beleevers; then you may with more colour of truth say, that the baptisme of infants preventeth the baptisme of beleevers, and make the baptisme of infants a different thing from it, which thing you can never do.

But peradventure you will say, (by infants here) you meane the infants of wicked and idolatrous parents; and not the infants of the faithfull.

To which I answer, that then you should have so exprested; But I would have you to mind, that though the act of baptising idolaters be different from the [baptising] of true Christians (in respect of the manner, effect, and application thereof) yet the [baptisme] is one and the same, even as the circumcising of the apostate Jews; and of those that were not Apostates, did not argue but that the circumcision was one and the same, but differed in the manner of administration, and in the application thereof.

Whereas you say, that the baptisme of infants as it is by authoritie ordained in this kingdome, doth thus farre prevent the baptising of beleevers, that hereby no native can be baptised upon faith, seeing all are to be baptised in their infancie, when they are destitute of faith: wherefore if all other Kingdoms and Nations did the same, then the commandment of Christ, for the baptisme of disciples (or beleevers) would be quite prevented, and destroyed out of the whole world, as well as it is out of this Kingdome.

* Rev. 22.15.
a Christian Reader, see Mr. Henry Barrow [a Martyr in Queen Elizabeths time] his discovery, (pa. 114. and so forth to the end of the discourse concerning this matter) where he handleth this particular

I answer, that though the natives infants in the Church of England be not baptised upon their faith; because Idolaters have no faith*; yet if any do return out of that Apostacie, they are not to be baptised again, no more then the penitent apostate Israelites were circumcised again; because (God having purged the evill of the manner of administering his ordinance) the ordinance is really accounted with God, (and ought so to be esteemed of his Saints) as done upon a right subject.

And though we had no right to baptisme (as we stood) in that estate, but wickedly usurped the same, yet being come out of Babel, that

that which is *God's*, we have a right unto; although we received the same before we separated from *Babel*; even so the *Apostates of Israel* (in their apostasy) had no right to the *circumcision*^a they received in ^a*Psal. 50. 16.* that *apostasy*, but when any of them returned to *Judah*^b, they were ^b*Hos. 2. 3, 4.* not commanded to be *circumcised* againe, because they then had a ^b*Jer. 9. 25, 26.* right to that *circumcision* which they had formerly received in that ^b*Chron. 30.* *idolatrous* way in which they had walked.

Even as a man which stealeth goods from the owner thereof, hath no right unto them; but if he bring the same back to the owner, and the owner give him that which he formerly stole^c, then he hath a * The stealing
of a thing doth not alter the property there-
of, or make the thing to be nothing.
^c *Exodus 22. 6.*

So when we were in the *idolatrous assemblies*, we were run awaies, and *apostates* from *God*, and *thieves* to *God*, like *Jeroboam* and his crew, but when we returned, we came and tendered to *God* that which we had stolen from him; even as the penitent *Israelites* did their *cir-* ^c*uncision*; and as *God* did not command them to be *circumcised* again, no more hath he commanded us to be *baptised* again; but is graciously pleased to bestow upon us those false gotten goods, which we unjustly did rest, and receive, from the hand of our old mother, ^c*Prov. 9. 17.* that *whore of Babylon*, which stole them from *God*: who ordinarily ^c*Rev. 9. 21.* doth mix her own traditions with *God's*, to make her own ware to pass in sale.

Whereas you say, that the *baptisms* of *disciples* (or *believers*) is out of this *kingdome of England*: Indeed I hope it is not so. For there are a number of *baptised* *believers* who do *baptise* their infants, and so long as they so do, the ordinance of *baptising* *disciples* (or *believers*) will not out of the land where they are now, or wheresoever (by *God's* providence) they shall be cast. And you should mind that the *baptism* in the *Church of England* appertaineth to the *feodary*, therefore, it is theirs properly; and though *infidels* (by *God's* permission) sacriligiouly abuse it, yet they do not destroy it, but rather destroy themselves with it, as the *Philistines** ^c*1. Sam. 5. 9.* in retaining the *Arke*. But I could wish that you would put a distinction between [*baptism*] and *baptising*, the manner of *baptising* being theirs, but the *baptism* properly *God's*, appertaining to his *Church*, as well as the outward court (in the *Law*) appertained to the *Temple**. ^c*2. Chron. 4. 9.*

Further (you say) that if any shall here object and say, the discovering of the vices of this forme of *baptising* is needless, seeing divers persons seem already to be so frivolous and simple, that they much dislike it, and
will.

will not have their children baptised with godfathers, but upon other grounds, namely, from the covenant made with believers, and their children, upon which ground also, they of the separation use to baptise their children, wherefore their arguments should have been likewise answered.

To this you answer:

1. Although some few see this forme of baptising to be sinfull and naught, yet what is this to the rest of the whole Nation, who yet make conscience of that Idol to this day?

2. Although they of the separation, and some others, do mend the matter (as they think) in the baptising of their children otherwise, and upon other grounds, yet what is all this to their own baptisme, being naught by their own confession; and a nullite also, even from their own grounds: for they grant, that no children save onely believers children, are in the covenant, or have right to baptisme; then most of themselves had no right to baptisme, their parents (by their own acknowledgement) being ungodly: whence it will follow, that they themselves being baptised in their infancy, had not the baptisme of Christ, and so by consequence are yet unbaptised persons: Thus is their own baptisme clearly made void from their own grounds, and how then can their children be now baptised in the right of such parents, who are yet unbaptised themselves?

To all which I reply: That though I hold the discovering of the evill forme of baptising to be needfull, yet I dislike your evill proceedings in the discovery thereof.

But whereas you speake of the forme of baptising, and the forme of baptisme both in the objection^a, and the answer which you make^b, I suppose, you intend the set forme for baptising, mentioned in the Common Prayer Book, and this (I conceive) is the Idol, which you say^c, many make conscience of to this day; and if this be your meaning, I will not oppose you, because I am of that mind, and so are the best informed Christians, that the Common Prayer Book is vaine and Popish, and meeter for [Babes, brats] then for [Sions babes], and better besemming time-servyng [Mass-mongers] to be occupied therein, then the faidfull, laborious, and painfull Ministers of the Gospel.

Whereas you say, the separation and some others do mend the matter (as they think) in the baptising of their children otherwise, and upon other grounds.

I answer. If by the separation you meant those that are come out of Babes (I say,) I know none (either young or old) that have

have right to baptisme in *Babel*, or if they walk in any of the sinnes of *Babel*, and will not be reclaimed ; they have no right to any of Gods ordinances, because they are not visible *Saints*. And therefore they cannot have such grounds for baptising their infants, as the *Saints* have for baptising theirs : for those that are out of covenant themselves, as they cannot lawfully apply the covenant to their seed, (nor to themselves) no more can they apply the seal of the Covenant ; neither is it lawtull for them to baptise any at all , whether believers or unbelievers, for it is sacrilege for any that are not visible *Saints* to administer or partake of any of Gods ordinances.

And whereas you ask the separation (and these some others) what all this is to their own baptisme, which (say you) is naught by their own confession.

Answ. Here I suppose you do not take along with you the distinctions of the separation ; for we say that when we were in *Babylon*, the baptisme we received was not properly ours, but Gods baptisme, appertaining onely to visible *Saints*. And though we hold the manner of [baptising] to be naught, yet the [baptisme] in it self we affirm, and haue proved (and will still further prove upon occasion) that it is good; but the baptisme of the holy Infants of believers administered upon them out of *Babel*, we hold to be good in every respect , and that it hath no need of any purgation. And I suppose you alledge nothing against the baptisme we administer now, but onely the miniorie of the subject (which you account in no better an estate then a heathen.) And because we have not such a multiplication of the element as may dip a man in, all over.

As for those some others besides Separates, which, you also say, demand the matter, I know not who they be, if they are not separated from the unclean thing, they are unclean ; and how do they mend the matter, that are not amended themselves ?

We do not say, that no children, save onely believers children, are in the covenant, or have right to Baptisme ; you here mistake us (or else mistake your self) for we affirm that some unbelievers children are in the covenant, though their parents are out of the covenant ; and we also hold, that some believers children are out of the covenant, though their parents are in the covenant ; but such of their children as are infants, and (also such of years) which depart not from the steps of their righteous parents) we judge to be in the covenant ; Now, I say, if by children you mean infants, then we still affirm, that all the chil-

dren of unbelievers [in their infancie] are out of the covenant, (so far as men can judge) and have no right to baptisme, [their parents being ungodly.]

For how can the infants be said to be godly, in visibilitie, [either by action, or imputation] so long as their parents are visible idolaters, either personally, or statitively: Surely, where the guilt of originall sinne is not to be judged to be imputatively done away by Christ, the visible seal of the forgivenesse of that sinne ought not to be applyed, but their guilt of originall sinne is not [in Gods revealed will] declared (and therefore is not of us to be judged) to be imputatively done away by Christ.

Therefore baptisme (which is the visible seal of the forgivenesse of that sinne,) ought not to be applyed unto such persons.

And though we affirm, that we had no right to baptisme in the state of Apostacie, (our parents being then Antichristians) yet it will not follow (as you would inferre) that we had not the baptisme of Christ: neither by our own grounds, nor from any ground you have, or (I suppose) can alledge against the same; And therefore there is no place for you to build any just consequence that we are unbaptised persons; yea though you upon this unnescessarie consequence build an affirmation, that our own baptisme is clearly made void even from our own grounds; and upon this conceit of yours, you ask how then can their children be now baptised in the right of such parents, who are yet unbaptised themselves? and so you take for granted, that which you cannot prove. For I think in this particular concerning the baptisme of such infants, you may seek your opposite among the Babylonians, for I conceive no Seperate will in this oppose you.

But (you say) the grounds which Separates and others do urge for the baptising of Infants, shall be further examined and answered (if God will) in another Treatise.

To which I answer, that there shall be a Reply made thereunto with all speed (God willing) in another Treatise.

Next you adde, that if any shall think it strange and unlikely, that all the godliest Divines, and best Churches, should be thus deceived in this point of Baptisme for so many yeers together.

Let them consider (say you) that all Christendome (except here and there one, or some few, or no considerable number) was swallowed up in grosse Popery for many hundred yeers before Luthers time, which was not untill about 200 yeers agone.

To which I answer, that all this is nothing at all to the point, for the apostake of Israel was for many hundred years; and yet the Sainrs, I suppose, did not doubt but the Apostates were deceived in the point of circumcision; howbeit not simply in circumcising, or in circumcising of Infants, (for that was the ordinance of God) but in circumcising in apostasy, and imposing the signe upon Apostates, and their apostate seed, Therefore (the Prophet Isaiah saith unto God) thou hast forsaken thy people, the house of Jacob: because they are replenished from the East, and are soothsayers like the Philistines, and please themselves in the children of strangers. Isa. 2. So then Apostates are not deceived (simply) in the act of baptisme, or in administering it upon infants (only as they are infants) but because they baptise in that Idolatrous and Apostate state, and administer the signe upon the infants of godly parents.

In comparing the Baptisme of Infants with the abominable hierarchy, you foully mise, (especially if you meane the infants of godly parents;) you might as well have said, that the circumcision of Infants was as bad as Jerobomms hierarchy which he made of the lowest of the people. But considering that the circumcision of holy Infants was the same signe^b and seal^c of the righteousness of faith which Abraham had; and considering that baptisme is come in the stead of it, and that it is no leſſe generall then circumcision, nor inferiour thereunto^d, you may perceive that the baptisme of Infants is an ordinance from heaven.

But the hierarchy are the armie of Locusts, which came from hell, and were hatched in the [smoke] of the bottomles pit^e, which smoke is somewhat like to Bishop Hals foggy Divinitie, which you have set down^f for memorandamp. In whose judgement (you say) the baptisme of Infants hath leſſe warrant, then the hierarchy; but this his erronious judgement, will stand you in no stead, neither will his challenge^g nor the judgement of any other (though never so much noted) avail you any thing at all, in this your opposition of the baptisme of the infants of beleivers. Neither can Bishop Hall on the one side, nor you on the other side, (with all the help you can get) overthrow the baptisme of Infants; for all your words without the authoritie of Scripture is but wind; for it is presumption (or ignorance at the best) in Bishop Hall and you: so to speak concerning Infants baptisme, as if the Scripture owned it not.

But all which you have here said doth not overthrow our baptisme

^a 2. King.

^b Gen. 17.

^c Rom. 4.

^d Col. 2.

^e Rev. 9.3.

^f Pa. 30, at
li. 8.

^g Lin. 27.
28, 29, 30.

which we received in the Church of England; for if Apostates should weare out Gods ordinance of Baptisme, any more then the eApostates of Israel did weare out the ordinance of circumcision in the time of Israels Apostasy (before Christ was manifested in the flesh) it would argue a great weaknesse, and imperfection in Christ, as if he were not so faithfull in his house as Moses, or as if Baptisme were of smaller value, and sooner worne out then circumcision.

But you(in the entrance of your Treatise) have granted it to be a great ordinance of the New Testament. To which I further adde for conclusion, that as circumcision was not worn out, but was so permanent that it remained till Christ's first coming, and till he took away the beggerly rudi-
ments of the old Covenant: so baptisme hath not nor shall not be worne out or taken away, but remaine as permanent, till Christ come to give us the substance of all his ordinances; the ac-
complishment of all his promises, the enjoyment of that immortall
and unchangeable inheritance which shall never be worne out,
Or taken away, but remaine from everlasting to everlasting.

F I N I S.

*Errata.*

P Ag. 12. lin. 7. for Christ's, read, Christ. li. 37. leave out these words, that the
Apostles so did baptize. p. 13. l. 8. in the Marg. for Psal. 16. 17, r. Psal. 77. 16. 17.

